

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1980

Taxpayer Satisfaction With Public Urban Services in Salt Lake County

Lea J. Cottam

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cottam, Lea J., "Taxpayer Satisfaction With Public Urban Services in Salt Lake County" (1980). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 2279.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/2279>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



TAXPAYER SATISFACTION WITH PUBLIC URBAN
SERVICES IN SALT LAKE COUNTY

by

Lea J. Cottam

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Home Economics and Consumer Education

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writing of a thesis is never done alone and there are several people to whom I owe thanks.

Jane McCullough spent many hours reading my rough drafts. Her advice and concern are responsible for the success of this project. There is no adequate way to thank her.

Alison Thorne, Michael Etzel, and William Furlong, who served as members of my committee, also provided moral support and technical advice that was most valuable. Special thanks to Bill for his cynicism that prodded me on.

Thanks must also go to my family and friends who put up with me through all this. A special thank you also goes to a dedicated friend who volunteered to type the final copy.

Thanks to all.

Lea J. Cottam
Lea J. Cottam

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
The Citizen as a Consumer	5
Public vs. Private Marketplace	5
Lack of Research	7
Problems in Measurement	7
Satisfaction	10
The Problem in Salt Lake County	11
Conclusions	13
METHODS AND PROCEDURES	15
Purpose	15
Hypotheses	15
Rationale for Hypotheses	16
Definitions	16
Sample	17
Data Collection	19
Survey Instrument	19
Pretest	20
Analysis	20
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	21
Demographic Characteristics	21
Length of Residence	21
Employment	21
Age	21
Sex	23
Marital Status	24

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
Educational Level	24
Income	25
Assessed Valuation	27
General Findings	28
Public Services	28
Levels of Government	30
Money's Worth	33
Hypotheses	33
Hypothesis One	33
Hypothesis Two	35
Hypothesis Three	36
Hypothesis Four	37
Hypothesis Five	37
Hypothesis Six	37
Hypothesis Seven	37
Hypothesis Eight	38
Hypothesis Nine	39
Other Findings	41
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	43
Limitations	44
Recommendations	45
BIBLIOGRAPHY	46
APPENDIXES	49
Appendix A	50
Appendix B	55
Appendix C	57

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Disposition of Sample	18
2. Length of Residence	22
3. Employed by a Government Agency	22
4. Age	23
5. Sex	24
6. Marital Status	25
7. Educational Attainment	26
8. Income	27
9. Assessed Valuation	28
10. Satisfaction with Services	29
11. Satisfaction with Services by Area	31
12. Satisfaction with Government Units	32
13. Satisfaction with Government Units by Area	32
14. Money's Worth in Public Urban Services	33
15. General Satisfaction with Services	34
16. Satisfaction with Services Compared to Structural Changes	35
17. Satisfaction as Related to Hypotheses	36
18. Satisfaction as Related to Government Structure	38
19. More Likely to Complain to Business than Government	39
20. Summary of Complaints to Retail Businesses	40
21. Summary of Complaints to Government Agencies	41

ABSTRACT

Taxpayer Satisfaction with Public Urban Services
in Salt Lake County

by

Lea J. Cottam, Master of Science
Utah State University, 1980

Major Professor: Jane McCullough
Department: Home Economics and Consumer Education

Although citizens do not generally consider themselves consumers of public services in the same sense they consider themselves consumers in the retail marketplace, their demand for public services clearly affects what local government units provide. Citizens are involved daily with the consumption of public urban services; yet most consumer education textbooks and teaching materials ignore tax supported services.

The purpose of this study was to measure the satisfaction of consumers with certain public urban services, public officials, and several units of government.

Satisfaction was found to be correlated with age, length of residence in the community and the respondents' attitudes toward elected officials. There was no apparent correlation between satisfaction with services and income, education, or assessed valuation of the respondents' dwellings. Satisfaction scores of the four geographic areas sampled were not significantly different.

Respondents did not generally feel they received their money's worth in public services for what they paid in property taxes. They were,

however, generally satisfied with the services they received.

Respondents also seemed more likely to voice dissatisfaction to retail distributors than to government agencies.

(65 pages)

INTRODUCTION

Money is, with propriety, considered as the vital principle of the body politic; as that which sustains its life and motion and enables it to perform its most essential functions. A complete power, therefore, to procure a regular and adequate supply of revenue, as far as the resources of the community will permit, may be regarded as an indispensable ingredient in every constitution. From a deficiency in this particular, one of two evils must ensue: either the people must be subjected to continual plunder, as a substitute for a more eligible mode of supplying public wants, or the government must sink into a fatal atrophy, and, in a short time, perish. (Hamilton, 1787, p. 188)

No matter how unpopular taxes are, some sort of taxation must be maintained in order for government to operate. Under the Articles of Confederation, the new United States government had no legal authority or power to levy or collect taxes. The federal government had to rely on the willingness of the people to donate money, supplies, and manpower (Garraty, 1974). As Hamilton noted, this was an ineffective method of financing. Therefore, the power and authority to tax were written into the United States Constitution (The Constitution of the United States, Article One, Sections 8, 9, and 10).

Taxes are levied to finance a variety of specific services at the various levels of government. They are also used to regulate and control commercial activities, redistribute income and stimulate economic development. Some of the taxes levied for these purposes are income tax, property tax, sales tax, and licensing fees. The property tax is the main source of revenue for most city and county governments.

Almost every citizen is subject to taxation and almost every American consumes services financed by taxes from the day he is born until the day he dies.

Despite the necessity of taxation to finance the public's demand for services, controversy seems to have been a constant companion of taxation. Salt Lake County has been no exception. The services provided to the taxpayers of Salt Lake County have been a major source of interlocal disagreement for the past 22 years. The controversy has centered around "double taxation." The question has been whether the taxpayers in the incorporated cities pay twice for public services received from only one of the levels of government providing the services.

The accounting system used in the past by Salt Lake County has not lent itself to quick and easy cost analyses. The county has encountered extreme difficulty in trying to determine whether tax dollars collected from city residents have been used to provide "city services" to residents of the unincorporated areas of the county. Estimating the actual cost of providing specific services to individuals has been, and still is, a tremendous problem (Snow, 1977).

The continuing controversy among city and county officials and citizens' groups, as reflected in the newspaper accounts of the confrontations, demonstrates the importance of the citizens' opinions and perceptions regarding the services received and their satisfaction with those services. During the past year, two new cities have been incorporated in Salt Lake County. Residents of Draper voted in February 1978 to take over the responsibility of providing its own services. Bluffdale followed suit in September 1978. These incorporations were in direct protest of the cost to benefit inequities perceived by taxpayers in the two communities. Residents felt that

they could provide the services, then administered by the county, at a lower cost, or at least, in a more satisfactory manner. The moves to incorporate culminated several years of growing dissatisfaction with the administrative policies and practices governing the delivery of public urban services to these communities.

Citizens across the United States have expressed dissatisfaction with the proportion of their incomes that goes to pay property taxes. This was evidenced by the passage of Proposition 13 in California which limited property taxes to 1 percent of the fair market value of the property. Despite the growing wave of opposition to government revenue collection and spending, little serious effort has been put into studying citizens' perception of the services they receive or their satisfaction with those services. The citizens' point of view needs to be taken into consideration. Citizens are the consumers who must "buy" the services being provided by their government. It should be noted that they do not often see themselves as consumers of public services in the same manner that they see themselves as consumers of private, retail services. Most consumer education textbooks have also ignored the consumers' role in the marketplace of tax supported services.

However, knowing how the consumers of public services view those services could be useful to the officials of the governing units as they attempt to make policies concerning the future service delivery structures in Salt Lake County.

This study looks at the satisfaction of citizens with certain public urban services, their attitudes toward local elected officials and different units of government, and their feelings about government compared with retail service delivery systems.

In view of continued attempts to find a better service delivery structure, this researcher believes that this study may be useful in stimulating interest in collecting citizen satisfaction data for use by local governments.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Citizen as a Consumer

Much has been said in recent years about consumer awareness and influence in the marketplace. Little, however, seems to have filtered into the public service arena, even though virtually every resident of the United States pays for, and consumes, public services all of his life.

Modern urban man is born in a publicly financed hospital, receives his education in a publicly supported school and university, spends a good part of his life traveling on publicly built transportation facilities, communicates through the post office and the quasi-public telephone system, drinks his public water, disposes of his garbage through the public removal system, reads his public library books, picnics in the public parks, is protected by his police, fire, and health systems; eventually dies, again in a hospital, and may even be buried in a public cemetery (sic). Ideological conservatives notwithstanding, his life is inextricably bound up with governmental decisions on these and numerous other local public services. (Teitz, 1968, p. 36)

Though the citizen may not perceive himself as part of the system, "the consumption of government services . . . places the individual in the political arena. Although he may be unaware of the implications of his actions, his behavior often constitutes demand for services" (Jacob, 1972, p. 125).

Public vs. Private Marketplace

A good many firms in the United States employ marketing research staffs to monitor consumer satisfaction with the goods and/or services produced by the company. However, when government agencies provide the services to the citizenry, using taxpayers' dollars, little thought

seems to be given to "marketing research." Of course, there are differences to be noted in the two marketing processes. In the private market, if the good produced does not provide satisfaction to the consumer in excess of its cost, the consumer stops purchasing the product and the company suffers a loss. The individual is free to purchase or not to purchase and, in effect, "votes" for or against continued production.

However, "government decisions involve a degree of compulsion" (Eckstein, 1964, p. 17). The consumer casts his vote for a package of services by voting for a representative, such as a city councilman, who makes the policy decisions regarding public services and their delivery. Usually the consumer does not vote for a specific service.

The important distinction between ordinary government services and services provided under (free) enterprise principles lies in the nature of the decision-making process. Budgetary decisions, affecting regular government services are political decisions, reflecting judgments of legislatures regarding how much of the services are needed by the community and how much the taxpayers are willing to pay. (Fitch, 1967, p. 199)

Once the government has decided to provide a good or service, everybody pays for it through taxation. Taxes are collected whether or not the services are satisfactory (Eckstein, 1964). Lineberry and Welch (1974) noted that it would be extremely difficult in most cases, however, to move the public services into the private sector. One reason these services are provided by public rather than private means is that they cannot be easily evaluated by the private market's pricing mechanism.

Lack of Research

Despite the intricate involvement of each citizen in the consumption of public services, measuring the economics, efficiency, and equity of the services is a neglected, confused, and controversial area of study (Campbell, 1976).

It is difficult to explain the scholarly disinterest in public services. "Municipal services" evokes dreary images of sewers, streets, and other humdrum matters better left to public administrators than to scholarship. Yet, in a way, urban services are much like energy which goes unnoticed until it's suddenly less available or much more costly. (Lineberry, 1977, p. 267)

Part of the current underdevelopment of measurement is due to technical problems. However, a more important part of the problem has been a lack of interest in the part of local government units (Fisk and Winnie, 1974).

Problems in Measurement

Frequently, program evaluators look at program quality in terms of how well the agency's performance has met its own goals. This is unduly restrictive. It considers only one aspect of program quality: effectiveness, which Whitaker (1974) defined as attaining clearly outlined program goals. Hatry (1972) said the temptation with this is to stick to the workload type measures which are simply the quantity of work accomplished without reference to whether the service was adequate to meet the needs and wants of those who consumed it. For example, an agency might claim success because more tons of solid waste were picked up this year compared to last, rather than also taking into account whether it was picked up promptly, disposed of to

the satisfaction of the homeowners, and whether, indeed, all of the trash was picked up. It also disregards whether the cost of the service was acceptable.

Several authors have illustrated the problems encountered in attempting to measure the level, distribution, and satisfaction with public urban services. Ostrom (1974) noted that no absolute measure of output of services can be obtained. She defined output as the transformation that takes place when factors of production, such as money and manpower, are combined in an effort to "produce something" whether that something be education, roads, or a court system. Due to individual perceptions, only relative measures are attainable. For example, the presence of police patrol cars in one neighborhood may be seen as a hostile occupation while another group of citizens may view their presence as a mantle of protection. This presents a problem in evaluating the level of services distributed among the consuming citizens. Ostrom pointed out that there is difficulty in trying to measure the satisfaction of a group of consumers that has no choice in the consuming of certain services, such as street lighting, national defense, et cetera.

Lineberry and Welch (1974) cited three obstacles to using the distribution of services as a measure of satisfaction of the consuming public: (a) measuring the output of services in the context of intra-city distribution, (b) choosing a standard of use in evaluating service patterns, and (c) difficulty in getting "hard data" on the distribution of public services due to computerized records, inaccurate reports, and so forth. The researchers suggested that it seemed more accurate

to consider the quality of conditions after the receipt of services than to measure only the quantitative distribution of services. Equally distributed police patrols in high and low crime areas do not necessarily lead to the achievement of the goal of crime prevention or reduction (Kasarda, 1972).

Lineberry and Welch (1974) defined efficiency in distribution in two ways: theoretical and administrative. Theoretical distribution efficiency is defined as the situation existing when distribution cannot be changed to make some people better off without making others worse off. Administrative efficiency, on the other hand, was defined as getting the most output for the least input. The fact that efficiency can be defined in many ways has created problems in measurement.

Effectiveness, defined as meeting clearly outlined program goals, and responsiveness, defined as citizen satisfaction, are key words, according to Whitaker (1974). He pointed out that it makes little sense to base one's study on the number of police calls answered without noting how quickly or acceptably the calls were answered.

Other problems facing evaluators are the emotional entanglements associated with the decisions about how much revenue should be raised, how it should be raised, from whom it should be raised, and how great the financial burden should be (Dye, 1969). "These decisions often embroil communities in their most important political battles" (Dye, 1969, p. 445).

Multiple measures, such as cost efficiency, satisfaction of the consumers, effectiveness, and workload should be used in evaluating

public services (International City Managers Association Committee on the Quality of Municipal Services, 1973).

Satisfaction

The citizens' satisfaction with the services they receive is an important measure of adequate service delivery. Citizens may often be hesitant to voice their satisfaction or dissatisfaction, however, when a response is requested. Therefore, the citizens' complaints about and requests for service and information might be a good place for local governments to start collecting data (International City Managers Association Committee on the Quality of Municipal Services, 1973).

"By comparing the satisfaction of different citizens with the same public services we can learn more about equity in public programs" (Whitaker, 1974, p. 760). McGregor (1974, p. 45) said, "Satisfaction is the main standard for evaluating organizational action."

A study concerning satisfaction and contentment with public services, done by Rojeck, Clemente, and Summers (1975), surveyed people in three contiguous counties in Illinois. The sample included residents of rural areas, small towns, and cities. Satisfaction was measured by evaluating the manner in which the service was perceived and the standard against which the service was judged. The study noted that satisfaction did not, apparently, increase as a simple linear function of availability. There was also no apparent relation of income and educational levels to service satisfaction.

A Denver study by Loverich and Taylor (1976) showed that there were more negative attitudes toward local government in black and

Mexican-American neighborhoods than in Anglo areas. Neighborhoods were classified on the basis of Community Renewal Program rankings. Perceptions of the level of services were strongly related to the physical and economic conditions of the neighborhoods in which the subjects resided. The lower the socio-economic level of the neighborhood, the less satisfied the respondents were with the service delivery.

The physical and economic condition of neighborhoods are often reflected in the property tax assessment. The property tax is the major source of revenue for many counties, cities, and school districts. The burden of the property tax depends on the ratio of the assessed valuation of property to the fair market value.

Property taxes are often regressive because higher income groups have more wealth in untaxed forms of property.

Yet in defense of property taxation, it is often argued that no other form of taxation is really feasible for local governments. Local sales and income taxes force individuals and businesses to leave the communities levying them; real estate, on the other hand, is less easy to move about and hide from local tax assessors. Real estate taxes are the only type of taxes that can be effectively collected by relatively untrained local tax officials. (Dye, 1969, p. 457)

The Problem in Salt Lake County

A major problem in Salt Lake County has been how to organize the delivery structure of tax supported public services. Lack of adequate data regarding citizen satisfaction with the services and legal questions concerning which unit of government was legally responsible for providing the services have been factors contributing to the problem. Over the last two decades, studies concerning the delivery of public urban services have focused mainly on the equity, economics, and

legality of the service delivery, largely ignoring the citizens' viewpoints and expectations (Utah Business and Economic Review, 1970; Breitling, 1974; League of Women Voters, 1978).

The controversy over who should pay for what began in 1957, hitting the front pages of the newspapers with a report released by the Utah Foundation, a private, non-profit, tax research organization (Salt Lake Tribune, 1957; Deseret News, 1957). The report stated that taxpayers in the incorporated cities seemed to be paying both city and county for services received only from the city. Since then, elected officials have battled over the borders and the tax base. The county sent out notices to the cities that inter-local agreements for services would have to be renegotiated immediately or the county would cease to provide certain services it had taken on in the past. Officials of several cities quickly opted to tell the county their citizens were not satisfied with the way the county had been delivering the services and that the cities would take over the responsibilities (Salt Lake Tribune, 1968, 1972). The interest and controversy over public service delivery were intensified by a 1976 Utah Supreme Court ruling that said Salt Lake County would have to charge its municipal service customers on a cost basis, no longer financing those services out of tax funds supported by both city dwellers and residents of the unincorporated county.

It has been difficult to determine the exact level and distribution of services provided by government agencies precisely for the reasons mentioned earlier, which included varying citizen perceptions, equity of distribution as opposed to equity in neighborhood conditions after the receipt of services, choosing a standard by which services

should be evaluated, and the difficulty in getting "hard data" on the distribution, level, and cost of the services.

A number of studies have been done by a variety of groups who were usually trying to determine what the optimal form of government would be for the rapidly growing county. Since the groups were often seeking to promote one point of view or another, the studies often differ on their statements of what is and what ought to be (League of Women Voters, 1978; Breitling, 1974). There is, however, a striking similarity among the reports. Although some of the groups have involved small citizens' committees, none set out to ask the general taxpaying public what it thought about the services it was receiving or what it wanted the government to provide. Consequently, after two decades of arguing, there is still no general feeling of what would be best, as evidenced by the recent incorporation of Draper in February, 1978, and Bluffdale in September, 1978, and the defeat of the Bonneville City proposal in September, 1978, the city-county unification measure in November, 1978, and the urban county proposal in March, 1979.

Conclusions

After reviewing the events in Salt Lake County and the studies done in other areas of the country, it is apparent that the citizens' perceptions and satisfaction with public urban services are not generally being taken into account by policy makers. This may be because satisfaction is difficult to measure, particularly in an on-going manner; or it may be because citizens do not consider themselves as consumers of government supplied services with the same rights

and responsibilities they have in other consumer purchases: that is, the right to be informed, to be heard, to safety, and to choose (Kennedy, cited in Gordon, 1977). In either event, the citizens' feelings should be given more consideration. There is a need to develop a "concerted, systematic approach to social monitoring" (Rojeck, Clemente, and Summers, 1975, p. 190).

Providing the level of services which the citizens desire is a fundamental purpose of local government . . . Local government must begin to construct its own systems and to develop evaluation techniques to the point that municipal performance measurement can become a reality. (International City Managers Association Committee on the Quality of Urban Services, 1973, p. 1-2)

After reviewing the available literature, this researcher concluded that government officials should make a systematic effort to collect and evaluate citizens' perceptions and degree of satisfaction with public urban services.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to measure the satisfaction of four groups of property owners in Salt Lake County with several public urban services such as street lighting, planning and zoning, garbage collection, and animal control. Data were also collected on the respondents' attitudes toward public officials, different units of government, and government compared with retail service delivery systems.

Hypotheses

1. There will be no difference in satisfaction with public urban services between residents in areas where major service delivery changes have been made or considered and residents of other areas.
2. There will be no correlation between respondents' satisfaction with public services and the respondents' satisfaction with local elected officials.
3. There will be no correlation between the respondents' length of residence in the community and the respondents' satisfaction with public urban services.
4. There will be no correlation between the respondents' educational level and the respondents' satisfaction with public urban services.
5. There will be no correlation between the age of the respondents and the respondents' satisfaction with public urban services.

6. There will be no correlation between the respondents' annual income level and the respondents' satisfaction with public urban services.

7. There will be no correlation between the assessed valuation of the respondents' dwellings and the respondents' satisfaction with public urban services.

8. There will be no difference in satisfaction between respondents who favor current government service delivery systems and respondents who favor a change.

9. Respondents will not be any more likely to voice dissatisfaction to providers of goods and services purchased in the marketplace than to providers of services administered by local government agencies.

Rationale for Hypotheses

The demographic variables in hypotheses 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 were selected and tested to determine whether any socioeconomic factors affected satisfaction in general or satisfaction with particular services. This allowed for the identification of specific "market segments" or citizens who were dissatisfied and suggested areas where changes should be considered in service delivery.

Definitions

Satisfaction. Satisfaction, general contentment and acceptability, was defined in this study as a mean rating of 3.5 or more on a 5 point scale.

Dissatisfaction. Dissatisfaction, general discontent and unacceptability, was defined in this study as a mean rating of 2.5 or less on a 5 point scale.

Public urban services. The definition of services for this study included street lighting, planning and zoning, garbage collection, road and street maintenance, public parks and recreation, water, sewer, fire protection, police protection, and animal control.

Areas where major service delivery changes have been made or considered were defined as Draper City and the Granger-Hunter community. Both areas had recently considered municipal incorporations.

Sample

The original research design was to survey 400 residents of Salt Lake County with 100 respondents from each of four subgroups: Salt Lake City, the smaller incorporated cities, the unincorporated areas of the county, and the Draper and Granger-Hunter areas. The Salt Lake County assessor's tax rolls were used and 800 names were drawn for the sample. Originally, 1,000 names were to be drawn; however, as response on the pretest was extremely high, the sample size was reduced to 800 names.

Selection of names from the tax rolls was made by dividing 200 into the number of names on the tax rolls for each of the four subgroups. This determined the interval between names and assured that names at the ends of the rolls were not eliminated by virtue of their position. A roll of the die determined the random beginning point. The disposition of the 800 names drawn for the sample is shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Disposition of Sample

Disposition	Salt Lake City	Smaller cities	Unincorp. county	Draper Granger	Total
Commercial property	59	51	60	55	225
No phone number	6	9	7	11	33
Other	49	48	36	36	169
Refused	24	28	32	33	117
Completed	62	64	65	65	256
Unusable interviews	2	4	5	5	16
Total usable	60	60	60	60	240
Total	200	200	200	200	800

The "other" category included those persons who did not speak English, could not hear well enough to complete the interview, and residences where no one answered after six calls. Sixteen completed interviews were unusable due to interviewer error. Analysis was done on the 240 completed, usable interviews.

The completion rate for this research was:

$$\frac{256}{800-427} = \frac{256}{373} = 68.6\%$$

Data Collection

The interviews for the study were conducted by telephone by three interviewers trained by the researcher. The data were collected in August and September of 1978. The calls were made between the hours of 10 a.m. and 9 p.m. Monday through Saturday. Each residence was called six times before being eliminated from the sample. At least one of the six calls was placed during the evening.

Survey Instrument

A questionnaire was developed to obtain the opinions of taxpayers concerning their satisfaction with certain public urban services and their delivery to the taxpayer (Appendix A). It was comprised of 20 items: 10 concerning the respondents' satisfaction with 10 particular services, 7 concerning the respondents' satisfaction with the units of government and the officials administering the services, and 3 related to the respondents' feelings about being a consumer of retail services and government services. Seventeen of the items were arranged on a Likert-type scale. The respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction on a scale of one to five, one being very dissatisfied and five being very satisfied. The Likert-type scale was used because it is a convenient way of assigning a numerical value to the data. It also measured the degree of satisfaction readily and was easy to administer. Likert-type scales are often used in this type of data gathering (Smith, 1975). Three of the questions asked for open-ended responses. Nine demographic items were also included to ascertain place of residence, length of residence, sex, age, marital status, educational level,

assessed valuation, income level, and employment status. The assessed valuation was also recorded from the tax rolls.

Pretest

The survey instrument was pretested using 10 taxpayers who met the qualifications of the sample selected for the research. No revisions were found necessary at that time.

Analysis

Hypotheses 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 were tested using the Pearson Correlation Coefficient. A strength of relationship was also calculated because large samples often produce significant correlations by virtue of their size. Hypotheses one and eight were tested using Chi Square contingency tables. The Chi Square was tested for strength of relationship. Hypothesis nine was reported in terms of a mean score and standard deviation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Characteristics

Length of Residence

The mean length of residence of the respondents in their present dwelling was 17.5 years. The modal category for the taxpayers interviewed, however, was 0-5 years with 24.6 percent of the sample falling into this category (Table 2). More than one-third of the respondents from the smaller incorporated cities and the Draper and Granger-Hunter areas had lived at their present location for less than five years. The modal category for Salt Lake City and the unincorporated county was 20-29 years.

Employment

The respondents were asked whether or not they were employed by a government agency. Less than 10 percent responded affirmatively. Of those employed by a government unit, city and federal government agencies employed five respondents each, county government employed nine, and state government, one (Table 3).

Age

The average age for the respondents was 50.37 years. The modal age category for the Salt Lake City subgroup was 60-69 years. According to the 1970 Census, about 28 percent of the population in Salt Lake City was over 65. At least half the respondents in the smaller cities and the Draper and Granger-Hunter areas were less than 40 years old (Table 4).

Table 2
Length of Residence

No. of years	<u>Salt Lake City</u>		<u>Smaller cities</u>		<u>Unincorp. county</u>		<u>Draper Granger</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0-5	7	11.6	24	40.0	8	13.3	20	33.3	59	24.6
5-9	4	6.6	13	21.6	10	16.6	8	13.3	35	14.5
10-19	11	18.3	4	6.6	11	18.3	15	25.0	41	17.0
20-29	19	31.6	11	18.3	15	25.0	7	11.6	52	21.7
30-39	11	18.3	3	5.0	11	18.3	3	5.0	28	11.7
40 or more	7	11.6	4	6.6	3	5.0	5	8.3	19	7.9
no response	1	1.6	1	1.6	2	3.3	2	3.3	6	2.5
Total	60		60		60		60		240	

Table 3
Employed by a Government Agency

Employed by gov't	<u>Salt Lake City</u>		<u>Smaller cities</u>	<u>Unincorp. county</u>	<u>Draper Granger</u>	<u>Total</u>	
	No.	%				No.	%
no	59		54	49	46	208	86.6
yes	1		4	7	8	20	8.3
no response	0		2	4	6	12	5.0
Total	60		60	60	60	240	99.9*

*Percentages are rounded off.

Table 4

Age

Age	Salt Lake City		Smaller cities		Unincorp. county		Draper Granger		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
20-29	4	6.6	15	25.0	5	8.3	13	21.6	27	11.2
30-39	2	3.3	15	25.0	7	11.6	20	33.3	37	15.4
40-49	4	6.6	8	13.3	4	6.6	7	11.6	36	15.0
50-59	9	15.0	6	10.0	20	33.3	9	15.0	42	17.5
60-69	19	31.6	10	16.6	11	18.3	3	5.0	49	20.4
70-79	11	18.3	3	5.0	6	10.0	2	3.3	23	9.6
80+	9	15.0	1	1.6	2	3.3	3	5.0	14	5.8
no response	2	3.3	2	3.3	5	8.3	3	5.0	12	5.0
Total	60		60		60		60		240	

Sex

Of the respondents, 30 percent were males and 70 percent were females (Table 5). In 1970, about 39 percent of the Salt Lake City population over age 20 was male and about 61 percent was female (1970 U. S. Census). The balance of the county was 48 percent male and 52 percent female. While this is different than the sample drawn for this study, one possible explanation may be that women are more likely than men to answer the phone.

Table 5

Sex

Sex	Salt Lake City		Smaller cities		Unincorp. county		Draper Granger		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Male	21	35	15	25	15	25	21	35	71	30
Female	39	65	45	75	45	75	39	65	168	70
Total	60		60		60		60		240	

Marital Status

Most of the respondents from all four subgroups were married. Very few were separated, divorced, or single (Table 6). More than one-fourth of the Salt Lake City respondents were widowed. This is probably related to the fact that the sample was older than the samples of other subgroups. The 1970 U.S. Census reported that 20 percent of the Salt Lake City population was widowed.

Educational Level

The average educational attainment for the respondents was slightly above the high school graduation level. Modal categories were as follows: Salt Lake City, high school graduation; the smaller incorporated cities, some college; the unincorporated county, high school graduation; and the Draper and Granger-Hunter areas, high school graduation (Table 7). The 1970 U.S. Census reported the average educational attainment to be 12.5 years in both Salt Lake City and the balance of the county. One respondent, who had only a junior high

Table 6
Marital Status

Marital	Salt Lake City		Smaller cities		Unincorp. county		Draper Granger		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Married	40	66.6	55	91.6	45	75.0	44	73.3	184	76.7
Single	2	3.3	2	3.3	0	0.0	5	8.3	9	8.3
Widowed	16	26.6	3	5.0	14	23.3	5	8.3	38	15.8
Separated	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Divorced	2	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.3	4	1.6
No response	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.6	4	6.6	5	2.1
Total	60		60		60		60		240	

school education, apologized to the interviewer and commented that she did not feel her opinion should count for much because of her limited education.

Income

The mean income level was the \$10-15,000 category (Table 8). The modal category for Salt Lake City was \$5-10,000. The low income level in this group may be related to the facts that the population was older and that there was a relatively high number of widows. In the smaller cities, the modal category was \$15-20,000. The modal category for the unincorporated county was \$5-10,000 and the Draper and Granger-Hunter subgroup reported a modal category of \$10-15,000. According to the 1970 U.S. Census, the average income for Salt Lake City was \$15,761.

Table 7

Educational Attainment

Schooling completed	<u>Salt Lake City</u>		<u>Smaller cities</u>		<u>Unincorp. county</u>		<u>Draper Granger</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Elementary	1	1.6	1	1.6	0	0.0	1	1.6	3	1.3
Jr. high	5	8.3	10	16.6	3	5.0	4	6.6	22	9.2
Sr. high	20	33.3	19	31.6	25	41.6	29	48.3	93	38.8
Some college	15	25.0	21	35.0	22	36.6	17	28.3	75	31.3
Earned degree	19	31.6	9	15.0	8	13.3	8	13.3	44	18.3
No response	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.3	1	6.6	3	1.3
Total	60		60		60		60		240	

The average for the smaller cities was \$15,929. Salt Lake County, including all areas outside of Salt Lake City, averaged \$16,252. It should be noted that the 1970 data may be inaccurate in view of the rapid population changes that have occurred over the past nine years. There had been a 4.1 percent decrease in Salt Lake City's population between 1970 and 1975, while the unincorporated county had experienced a 14.5 percent increase. Dramatic increases in population have occurred in the smaller incorporated cities. Between 1970 and 1975, Murray's population had increased an estimated 28 percent; Sandy, an estimated 219 percent; and West Jordan, about 280 percent (1975 Population Estimates--U.S. Census Bureau).

Table 8

Income

Income	<u>Salt Lake City</u>		<u>Smaller cities</u>		<u>Unincorp. county</u>		<u>Draper Granger</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under \$5,000	11	1.8	5	8.3	9	15.8	4	6.6	29	12.1
5-10,000	18	30.0	10	16.6	18	30.0	6	10.0	52	21.7
10-15,000	9	15.0	14	23.3	11	18.3	18	30.0	52	21.7
15-20,000	6	10.0	15	25.0	5	8.3	17	28.3	43	18.7
20,000+	9	15.0	13	21.6	14	23.3	13	21.6	49	20.0
No response	3	5.0	0	0.0	1	1.6	2	3.3	6	2.5
Don't know	4	6.6	3	5.0	2	3.3	0	0.0	9	3.8
Total	60		60		60		60		240	

It is also interesting to note that there were several respondents who did not know or were not willing to estimate the annual income of their households. Lack of knowledge on the part of the respondents may also have affected the reported income levels.

Assessed Valuation

The mean assessed valuation of property owned by the respondents was \$3,639.72. The highest mean valuation was found in Draper and Granger-Hunter. The lowest was found in Salt Lake City (Table 9). It should be noted that this is the 1977 valuation and does not reflect the recent revaluation. Assessed valuation is the value against which the property tax is levied. In Utah, it is 12-20 percent of the fair market value.

Table 9

Assessed Valuation

	Salt Lake City	Smaller cities	Unincorp. county	Draper Granger	Total
Mean	3434.16	3501.25	3752.28	3871.18	3639.72
S.D.	2051.65	1528.51	2233.73	1301.40	1778.82
Observations	60	60	59	59	238

The high standard deviations can be explained by the wide range of assessed valuations. Salt Lake City ranged from a low valuation of \$1,075 to a high of \$10,575. Among the smaller cities, valuations were between \$780 and \$7,040; the unincorporated area ranged from \$1,045 to \$11,795; and the Draper and Granger-Hunter areas from \$315 to \$9,455.

General FindingsPublic Services

Respondents rated their satisfaction with 10 public urban services on a Likert-type scale ranging from one, which was very dissatisfied, to five, which indicated they were very satisfied with the service and its delivery. The mean response for the 10 services was 3.51 (Table 10).

The standard deviations for most of the services were relatively low. It is interesting to note that the services with the highest ratings had the lowest standard deviations, reflecting a consensus among the respondents.

Table 10
Satisfaction with Services

Public Service	Mean	S.D.
Sewer	3.94	.50
Fire protection	3.85	.60
Water	3.78	.75
Garbage collection	3.68	.96
Police protection	3.63	.91
Planning and zoning	3.43	.94
Streets and roads	3.41	1.07
Parks and recreation	3.40	1.00
Street lighting	3.18	1.18
Animal control	2.80	1.23
Mean response	3.51	

Sewer service received the highest rating, 3.94. Animal control services received a rating of 2.80, the lowest rating given to any of the 10 services. Sewer service may have received the high rating because citizens are not generally concerned about its operation until it does not work. Animal control, on the other hand, is a more noticeable problem and citizens would probably have more contact with the service or the lack thereof. It may be that the amount of awareness the citizens have concerning the operation of a particular service affects their assessment of its acceptability.

There was little difference between the subgroups on how they rated the 10 services (Table 11). Street lighting had the biggest difference in ratings among the subgroups. This may be because some areas do not have street lights or have lights that were installed shortly after the turn of the century while other areas have the benefit of modern lighting.

Levels of Government

The respondents were also asked to rate the performance of several levels of government that provide services to the public. Respondents were told which services were provided by each of the levels and what percentage of their tax levy was used to support each of the units. This was done before the respondents rated the government unit. Special districts such as library and health districts received the highest rating, 3.92, while schools had the lowest rating, 3.13 (Table 12).

Several of the respondents commented that they felt people who did not have children or those on fixed incomes who had already paid to educate their children should not have to pay taxes to support education. Others expressed dissatisfaction with the Salt Lake City school board for "tearing down the old schools and then having to build new ones." The Jordan School District drew criticism for the "open classroom" arrangement of its schools and the crowded conditions.

There was little difference between the subgroups concerning their feelings about the units of government. Respondents from the unincorporated county area rated each of the units slightly lower than did the other areas (Table 13).

Table 11
Satisfaction with Services by Area

Service	Salt Lake City		Smaller cities		Unincorp. county		Draper Granger		Total	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Sewer	3.88	.55	3.97	.49	3.92	.38	3.93	.69	3.94	.50
Fire protection	4.05	.34	3.87	.65	3.61	.56	3.88	.72	3.85	.60
Water	3.78	.74	3.73	.80	3.83	.56	3.82	.83	3.78	.75
Garbage collection	3.80	.94	3.88	.72	3.35	1.07	3.71	.94	3.68	.96
Police protection	3.42	1.00	3.83	.76	3.50	.89	3.75	.90	3.63	.91
Planning and zoning	3.42	.94	3.32	1.03	3.58	.70	3.42	1.05	3.43	.94
Roads and streets	3.50	1.11	3.48	1.08	3.32	1.00	3.38	1.09	3.41	1.07
Parks and recreation	3.53	.85	3.55	1.00	3.40	.89	3.13	1.20	3.40	1.00
Street lighting	3.63	1.10	2.93	1.27	3.18	1.02	2.97	1.21	3.18	1.18
Animal control	2.50	1.27	3.00	1.29	2.75	1.04	2.98	1.26	2.80	1.23

Table 12

Satisfaction with Government Units

Government unit	Mean	S.D.
SPECIAL DISTRICTS (health and library) 8.1 percent of the levy	3.92	.87
MUNICIPAL/SERVICE DISTRICTS (garbage collection, street lighting, water, sewer, parks, etc.) 12.1 percent of the levy	3.34	1.03
COUNTY (social services, jail, sheriff, regional parks, clerk, etc.) 20.6 percent of the levy	3.24	1.02
SCHOOLS 59.1 percent of the levy	3.13	1.28

Table 13

Satisfaction with Government Units by Area

Gov't unit	Salt Lake City		Smaller cities		Unincorp. county		Draper Granger		Total	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Special districts	4.02	.94	4.06	.80	3.66	.94	3.96	.73	3.92	.87
Municipal/ service	3.66	.87	3.38	1.01	3.06	1.04	3.25	1.12	3.34	1.03
County	3.36	.98	3.41	.96	2.97	1.02	3.20	1.14	3.24	1.02
Schools	3.04	1.30	3.08	1.30	2.86	1.27	3.54	1.21	3.13	1.29

Money's Worth

Respondents were asked whether they thought people generally got their money's worth in public services for what they paid in local property taxes. Mean response was 2.51 (Table 14). A rating of two reflected a response of "not usually" on a scale of one to five and a response of three reflected "no opinion" or neutral.

Table 14

Money's Worth in Public Urban Services

	Salt Lake City	Smaller cities	Unincorp. county	Draper Granger	Total
Mean	2.70	2.42	2.31	2.63	2.51
S.D.	1.04	1.06	1.10	1.07	1.07
Observations	56	53	49	56	214

Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

There will be no difference in satisfaction with public urban services between residents of areas where major service delivery changes have been considered or made and residents of other areas. This hypothesis was not rejected.

Draper, which recently incorporated, and Granger-Hunter, which recently considered incorporation, made up the subgroup of "areas where major service delivery changes have been considered or made." Salt

Lake City, the smaller incorporated cities, and the unincorporated county area comprised the other subgroup.

The corrected Chi Square for the two by two contingency table was .00268 with one degree of freedom. This would only be significant at the .95 level. The .05 level is the generally accepted level of significance. Phi was calculated to be .043. Phi is a strength of relationship measure for Chi Square. It ranges from zero, no correlation, to one, which is a perfect correlation.

Residents in all four subgroups were generally satisfied with the services they received (Table 15). Satisfaction was defined as a mean rating of 3.5 or more on a scale of one to five on the 10 services surveyed. The scores for each of the services were added together and averaged to obtain an overall satisfaction score.

Table 15
General Satisfaction with Services

	Salt Lake City	Smaller cities	Unincorp. county	Draper Granger	Total
Mean	3.55	3.55	3.45	3.50	3.51
S.D.	.46	.40	.35	.55	.44
Observations	60	60	59	60	239

The standard deviations were extremely low and very similar among the four groups. This seems to indicate a consensus of opinion.

Almost 97 percent of the respondents in the Draper and Granger-Hunter areas were satisfied with the services they received. Over 94 percent of the respondents in the other areas were also satisfied (Table 16). This is interesting when compared to the respondents' feeling as tabulated in Table 14 which indicated that the respondents did not feel people got their money's worth from public services.

Table 16

Satisfaction with Services Compared to Structural Changes

	No change in delivery structure	Change recently considered or made
Not satisfied	6 respondents (5.4%)	1 respondent (3.1%)
Satisfied	106 respondents (94.6%)	31 respondents (96.9%)

The other 96 respondents either did not answer or did not fall above 3.5 or below 2.5 on their satisfaction rating.

Hypothesis Two

There will be no correlation between respondents' satisfaction with public services and the respondents' satisfaction with local elected officials.

These variables were positively correlated. The Pearson Correlation Coefficient was .4252. This reflected a fairly strong correlation. The level of significance for the correlation was .001 (Table 17). The

r^2 value, which represents the percent of the variability that can be explained by the factor was .1849.

Table 17
Satisfaction as Related to Hypotheses

Hypotheses	r	r^2	n of cases	level of significance
2. Officials	.4252	.1764	210	.001
3. Length of residence	.1249	.0169	232	.05
4. Educational level	.0113	.0011	236	.86
5. Age	.2083	.0441	226	.002
6. Income	.0485	.0025	232	.46
7. Assessed valuation	.0090	.00001	237	.89

Hypothesis Three

There will be no correlation between the respondents' length of residence in the community and the respondents' satisfaction with public urban services.

These variables were positively, but very weakly, correlated. The Pearson Correlation Coefficient was .1249. The level of significance was .05. The value for r^2 was .0169. Less than 2 percent of the variation was explained by the length of residence in the community (Table 17).

Hypothesis Four

There will be no correlation between the respondents' educational level and the respondents' satisfaction with public urban services.

The Pearson Correlation Coefficient was .0113. The level of significance was .86. The generally accepted level is .05 (Table 17).

This finding agrees with that of Rojeck, Clemente, and Summers (1975) who also found no correlation between educational level and service satisfaction.

Hypothesis Five

There will be no correlation between the age of the respondents and the respondents' satisfaction with public urban services.

The Pearson Correlation Coefficient was .2083. The level of significance was .002. The r^2 value was .0441, or about 4 percent of the variation was explained by age (Table 17).

Hypothesis Six

There will be no correlation between the respondents' annual income level and the respondents' satisfaction with public urban services.

There was no correlation between these variables. The Pearson Correlation Coefficient was .0485 with a level of significance of .46 (Table 17).

This agreed with the findings of Rojeck, Clemente, and Summers (1975) who also found that there was no correlation between income level and satisfaction with services.

Hypothesis Seven

There will be no correlation between the assessed valuation of the

respondents' dwellings and the respondents' satisfaction with public urban services.

Satisfaction was not correlated with the assessed valuation. The Pearson Correlation Coefficient was .0090 with a level of significance of .89 (Table 17).

Hypothesis Eight

There will be no difference in satisfaction between respondents who favor current government service delivery systems and respondents who favor a change. The hypothesis was not rejected.

The corrected Chi Square for the two by two contingency table was .14584 with one degree of freedom. This is significant only at the .70 level. Phi was calculated to be .00694 (Table 18).

Table 18
Satisfaction as Related to Government Structure

	Favor change	Favor status quo
Not satisfied	2 respondents (33.3%)	4 respondents (66.7%)
Satisfied	27 respondents (34.6%)	51 respondents (65.4%)

Both satisfied and dissatisfied respondents were more likely to favor the status quo than a change in the government structure which would affect the public service delivery they now receive. About two-

thirds of the respondents in each group said they did not favor a change in the current government structure.

The other 156 respondents either did not respond or did not fall above 3.5 or below 2.5 in their satisfaction rating.

Hypothesis Nine

Respondents will not be any more likely to voice dissatisfaction to providers of goods and services purchased in the marketplace than to providers of services administered by local government agencies. The hypothesis was not accepted.

The mean for this item was 3.64 on a scale of one to five with a standard deviation of .981. A rating of one reflected strong disagreement with the statement that the respondent would be more likely to voice dissatisfaction with a service purchased from a retail business than to a government agency which provided a service. A rating of five reflected strong agreement with the statement (Table 19).

Table 19

More Likely to Complain to Business than Government

	Salt Lake City	Smaller cities	Unincorp. county	Draper Granger	Total
Mean	4.06	3.64	3.68	3.20	3.64
S.D.	1.05	.84	.73	1.04	.981
Observations	47	56	32	55	190

This item seems to indicate that the respondents would be more likely to voice their feelings to retailers than to government officials. However, the item was not clearly worded and the results may reflect some confusion. It is suggested that this item be revised to a forced choice item since it is possible that respondents may interpret the "don't know" response as equal to the "disagree" response. Those who did not feel there would be a difference in their response may have responded with either "don't know" or "disagree." "Don't know" responses were defined as missing values and were not included in computing the mean. This could result in inaccurate conclusions.

Of the respondents, 60 percent had complained to a retail establishment about a good or service. Only 38 percent had complained to a government agency and about 2 percent did not respond to the item (Tables 20 and 21).

Table 20
Summary of Complaints to Retail Businesses

Retail	<u>Salt Lake City</u>		<u>Smaller cities</u>		<u>Unincorp. county</u>		<u>Draper Granger</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	30	50.0	41	68.3	33	55.0	40	66.6	144	60.0
No	30	50.0	18	30.0	27	45.0	19	31.6	94	39.0
No response	0	0.0	1	1.6	0	0.0	1	1.6	2	.8
Total	60		60		60		60		240	

Table 21

Summary of Complaints to Government Agencies

Government	<u>Salt Lake City</u>		<u>Smaller cities</u>		<u>Unincorp. county</u>		<u>Draper Granger</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	21	35.0	27	45.0	17	28.3	26	43.3	91	37.9
No	39	75.0	31	51.6	43	71.6	32	53.3	145	60.4
No response	0	0.0	2	3.3	0	0.0	2	3.3	4	1.6
Total	60		60		60		60		240	

Other Findings

The interviewers recorded any additional comments made by the respondents. The responses are summarized below.

The most common concern, expressed by 37 of the respondents, seemed to be that the elderly who are on fixed incomes could be taxed out of their homes. Rising taxes and rising prices were of great concern in all four areas surveyed. "The old folks on Social Security are in trouble," one respondent noted. Another added that people on welfare pay a limited amount in taxes, but people on fixed incomes keep paying higher taxes and can't get food stamps because of their savings accounts.

The next most common complaint focused on school problems. Eight respondents felt that people without children or whose children had already grown up should not have to pay taxes to support the school districts. Four complained that Salt Lake City keeps tearing down old buildings to build new ones. They saw this as a waste of taxpayers'

money. The "open school" design in Jordan School District also drew some criticism. Five individuals expressed dissatisfaction with the "frills" that are now found in schools. One respondent felt that children could learn better with hardwood floors than with carpet.

Seven respondents commented that they did favor a change in the form of government in Salt Lake County; but when asked which change they favored the typical response was "I don't know, but something has to be done." Four felt that some attempt should be made to have smaller government units with more local control because the current government structure was too inefficient and there was too much waste. Two felt that there was a lot of graft and irresponsibility on the part of county officials.

Fifteen felt it was useless to complain because "you can't fight city hall," or because "complaints fall on deaf ears." Two said there was no reason to even get involved enough to vote because "it doesn't make any difference anyway."

Two of the respondents had some ideas about how the problems all started. One respondent claimed the whole controversy originated with the gas price wars. Another suggested that allowing the "riff-raff" to vote was the source of the problem. The respondent defined "riff-raff" as government employees, those on welfare, and those who do not own property.

The interviewers also noted that there were 26 people who would have liked to respond to the questionnaire when called, but did not hear well enough, did not speak English well enough, or felt that their educational level was too low to make their responses of any value.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study measured the satisfaction of property owners in four areas of Salt Lake County with several public urban services, with elected officials, and with the operation of four units of government. The results of this study will be distributed to interested local officials and community development councils.

Data were collected by telephone interviews using a questionnaire developed and pretested by the researcher. Items were arranged on Likert-type scales. The instrument was administered by three interviewers trained by the researcher. A total of 256 taxpayers were interviewed yielding 240 completed responses.

Nine hypotheses were tested. Satisfaction with public urban services was found to be positively correlated with length of residence in the community, age, and the respondents' attitudes toward elected officials.

There was no apparent correlation between satisfaction with services and income or education. There was also no correlation between the assessed valuation of the respondents' dwellings and satisfaction with services. Contrary to what might have been expected, there were no apparent differences in satisfaction between respondents in areas where major service delivery changes had recently been made or considered and respondents from other areas of the county. The satisfaction scores of the four areas sampled were not significantly different.

Respondents did not generally feel they got their money's worth in public services for what they paid in property taxes. They were,

however, generally satisfied with the services they received and did not favor a change in the current structure of service delivery.

Respondents were more likely to voice dissatisfaction to retail suppliers of goods and services than to government suppliers. There were some limitations imposed on this conclusion by a lack of clarity in the statement of the item on the questionnaire.

Other findings reflected considerable concern for the elderly living on fixed incomes who were subject to hardships because of rising taxes. Schools were criticized because of dissatisfaction with current educational philosophies, building policies, and the fact that people who do not have children attending public schools have to provide financial support for their operation. Many respondents also felt that it was useless to complain to government officials because "you can't fight city hall," and "complaints fall on deaf ears."

Limitations

The following limitations were recognized for this study.

Discipline. The distribution and consumption of public services is not generally considered a part of the home economics and consumer education field. It should be recognized that this study was an initial attempt in this area.

Interviewers. The interviewers were not professionally trained public opinion data gatherers. Results might have been more accurate if the interviewers had had more training and experience.

Method. As noted in the review of literature, there are many problems associated with the collection of public service delivery data. In addition, telephone interviews have several drawbacks. Although

they are inexpensive, they seem to arbitrarily eliminate many elderly persons who have hearing impairments, the very poor who do not have phones, persons having unlisted phone numbers, and those whose command of English is too limited to permit effective communication over the phone. The interviewers also noted that many of those who chose not to participate in the survey expressed distrust and irritation with this method of data collection.

Sample. The sample drawn did not match demographic estimates for the total population. This might have resulted in some bias.

Recommendations

Recommendations resulting from this study include:

1. A concerted effort should be made by local government officials and public opinion professionals to develop effective methods of collecting citizen satisfaction data regarding public services.
2. Officials should make every reasonable effort to involve citizens in policy decisions regarding the delivery of public services.
3. A means of educating citizens concerning their roles as consumers of public services should be developed.
4. Consumer education textbooks and other teaching materials should include information to help students become aware of their rights and responsibilities as consumers of public services.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Breitling, T. O. Lessons in metro government. The Utah Independent, 1974.
- Campbell, A. K. Approaches to defining, measuring, and achieving equity in the public sector. Public Administration Review, 1976, 36, 556-562.
- Constitution of the United States. Sections 8, 9, and 10.
- Deseret News. May 1, 1957; May 29, 1976; Feb. 8, 1978; Sept. 13, 1978; Sept. 20, 1978; Nov. 8, 1978; March 21, 1979. Published in Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Dye, T. R. Politics in states and communities. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.
- Eckstein, O. Public finance. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
- Fisk, D. M., & Winnie, R. E. Output measurement in urban government: Current status and likely prospects. Social Science Quarterly, March 1974, 54, 725-740.
- Garraty, J. A. A short history of the American nation. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1974.
- Gordon, L. J., & Lee, S. M. Economics for consumers. New York: Litton Educational Publishing, Inc., 1977.
- Hamilton, A. The Federalist papers, No. 30. New York: New American Library, 1961. (Originally published, 1787.)
- Hatry, H. P. Issues in productivity measurement for local governments. Public Administration Review, 1972, 32, 776-784.
- International City Managers Association Committee on the Quality of Municipal Services. Achieving quality local government. Public Management, Sept. 1973, 55, 1-23.
- Jacob, H. Contact with government agencies: A preliminary analysis of the distribution of government services. Midwest Journal of Political Science, February 1972, 16, 123-146.
- Kasarda, J. D. The impact of suburban population growth on central city service functions. American Journal of Sociology, May 1972, 77, 1111-1124.

- League of Women Voters of Utah. Making sense of your tax dollars.
Salt Lake City, Utah: March 1973.
- Lineberry, R. L. On the politics and economics of urban services.
Urban Affairs Quarterly, March 1977, 12, 267-272.
- Lineberry, R. L., & Welch, R. E. Who gets what: Measuring the distribution of urban public services. Social Science Quarterly, March 1974, 54, 700-712.
- Loverich, N. P., Jr., & Taylor, G. T. Neighborhood evaluation of local government services: A citizen survey approach. Urban Affairs Quarterly, December 1976, 12, 197-222.
- Ostrom, E. Exclusion, choice and divisibility: Factors affecting the measurement of urban agency output and impact. Social Science Quarterly, March 1974, 54, 691-699.
- Rojeck, D. G., Clemente, F., & Summers, D. F. Community satisfaction: A study of contentment with local services. Rural Sociology, Summer 1975, pp. 177-191.
- Salt Lake County Auditor's Office. Interlocal cooperative agreements.
Salt Lake City, Utah: Author, December 1975.
- Salt Lake Tribune. May 2, 1957; January 6, 1968; April 2, 1968; April 5, 1968; June 29, 1972; June 30, 1972; May 29, 1976; February 8, 1978; September 13, 1978; September 20, 1978; November 8, 1978; March 21, 1979. Published in Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Smith, H. W. Strategies of social research, the methodological imagination. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.
- Snow, J. Remarks made at the Council of Governments Alta Conference. July 1977.
- State of Utah Department of Community Affairs. Interlocal agreements in Utah. Salt Lake City, Utah: Author, October 1975.
- Teitz, M. B. Toward a theory of urban public facility location. Regional Science Association Papers, 1968, 21, 36.
- University of Utah. Findings of the Utah local government modernization study. Utah Business and Economic Review, May 1970.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. Census of population and housing: 1970. Final Report PHC(1)184 Salt Lake City, Utah SMSA: Author, 1970.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. Population estimates and projections. Series P-25, No. 783: Author, 1979.
- Utah Foundation. Highlights. Rep. No. 339, Salt Lake City, Utah: Author, January 1975.

Utah Foundation. Statistical review of government in Utah. Salt Lake City, Utah: Author, March 1978.

Wasatch Front Regional Council. Wasatch front annexation guidelines and procedures. Technical report No. 4, Bountiful, Utah: Author, January 1977.

Welkowitz, J., Ewen, R. B., & Cohen, J. Introductory statistics for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1976.

Whitaker, G. P. Who puts the value in evaluation? Social Science Quarterly, March 1974, 54, 759-761.

Appendix A

Instrument

Hello. My name is _____. I am calling for Lea Cottam who is a graduate student at Utah State University doing research concerning the feelings of taxpayers in Salt Lake County. My interview takes about 10 minutes. Could I ask you a few questions?

Do you rent or own your home? _____ (If rent, end interview.)

Are you or your spouse employed by a government agency? _____

(If yes, ask which one.) _____

Thinking in terms of your neighborhood, please rate the following services as to whether you are very satisfied, generally satisfied, no opinion, generally unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied.

Street lighting

very satisfied	generally satisfied	no opinion	generally unsatisfied	very unsatisfied
-------------------	------------------------	---------------	--------------------------	---------------------

Planning and zoning

very satisfied	generally satisfied	no opinion	generally unsatisfied	very unsatisfied
-------------------	------------------------	---------------	--------------------------	---------------------

Garbage collection

very satisfied	generally satisfied	no opinion	generally unsatisfied	very unsatisfied
-------------------	------------------------	---------------	--------------------------	---------------------

Road and street maintenance

very satisfied	generally satisfied	no opinion	generally unsatisfied	very unsatisfied
-------------------	------------------------	---------------	--------------------------	---------------------

Public parks and recreation

very satisfied	generally satisfied	no opinion	generally unsatisfied	very unsatisfied
-------------------	------------------------	---------------	--------------------------	---------------------

Waterlines and supply

very satisfied	generally satisfied	no opinion	generally unsatisfied	very unsatisfied
-------------------	------------------------	---------------	--------------------------	---------------------

Sewer

very	generally	no	generally	very
satisfied	satisfied	opinion	unsatisfied	unsatisfied

Fire protection

very	generally	no	generally	very
satisfied	satisfied	opinion	unsatisfied	unsatisfied

Police protection

very	generally	no	generally	very
satisfied	satisfied	opinion	unsatisfied	unsatisfied

Animal control

very	generally	no	generally	very
satisfied	satisfied	opinion	unsatisfied	unsatisfied

Overall, how would you rate the way your community is being run?

What kind of job do you feel your elected city officials are doing?

excellent	good	don't know	fair	poor
-----------	------	------------	------	------

Overall, how would you rate the way the county is being run? What

kind of job do you feel your elected officials are doing?

excellent	good	don't know	fair	poor
-----------	------	------------	------	------

There has been a great deal of discussion about changing the structure of Salt Lake County government. Do you favor any of the proposed changes?

Do you think people generally get their money's worth in public services for what they pay in local property taxes?

always	usually	don't know	not usually	never
--------	---------	------------	-------------	-------

How would you rate the performance of the following levels of government and the services they provide?

You Pay--

County general fund
(20.6% of your property tax levy)

You Get--

Social services, jail, sheriff,
regional parks, clerk, etc.

very | | | | |
satisfied satisfied don't know unsatisfied unsatisfied

Municipal levy or special
district levies for those
outside incorporated cities
(12.1% of your property tax levy)

Garbage collection, street
lighting, planning and zoning,
parks, water, sewer, etc.

very | | | | |
satisfied satisfied don't know unsatisfied unsatisfied

Special districts for
health and libraries
(8.1% of your property tax levy)

Finances city-county health
department and library systems

very | | | | |
satisfied satisfied don't know unsatisfied unsatisfied

Schools
(59.1% of your property tax levy)

very | | | | |
satisfied satisfied don't know unsatisfied unsatisfied

Would you be more likely to voice your dissatisfaction with a service you use if you purchased it from a retail business instead of a government agency?

strongly | | | | |
agree agree don't know disagree strongly
disagree

Have you ever complained about a good or service you purchased from a retail business? If so, how?

Have you ever complained about a service you receive from local government? If so, how?

Additional comments:

Demographics

Place of residence incorporated _____ unincorporated _____

Community _____

Length of residence at your present address _____

Male _____ Female _____ Age _____

Marital status _____ (married, single, divorced, widowed, separated)

Educational level of respondent _____ spouse, if applicable _____

_____	_____	elementary
_____	_____	junior high
_____	_____	high school
_____	_____	some college
_____	_____	earned degree

Could you tell me what your annual property tax assessment is? _____

Is the annual income for your household:

Below \$5,000 _____

Between \$5,000 and \$10,000 _____

Between \$10,000 and \$15,000 _____

Between \$15,000 and \$20,000 _____

Above \$20,000 _____

Appendix B



DEPARTMENT OF
HOME ECONOMICS AND
CONSUMER EDUCATION
UMC 29

May 11, 1978

Mr. James Campbell
Salt Lake County Assessor's Office
City and County Building
400 S. State
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Dear Mr. Campbell,

I came into your office a few weeks ago and talked with you about the best way to draw the sample from the property tax rolls.

After some consideration, I think the best option is to take the 1975 roll from the auditor's office, if that is possible. If not, I will make arrangements to come down and draw the sample from the blotter sheets you showed me.

I appreciate your help with this project. I will call you in about a week to find out if I can use the auditor's 1975 tax roll when the new one comes.

Sincerely,

Lea Cottam
695 Darwin Ave. #4
Logan, UT 84321

LC/aw

Appendix C

DEPARTMENT OF
HOME ECONOMICS AND
CONSUMER EDUCATION
UMC 29

May 11, 1978

Ed Blaney
Salt Lake Council of Governments
South Salt Lake City Hall
2500 S. State
Salt Lake City, UT 84115

Dear Ed,

Life among the politically inclined seems to be getting more exciting all the time in Salt Lake County. COG meetings weren't always terribly exciting, but you guys didn't have to go this far.

I'm working on my masters degree here at Utah State and I'm about ready to take a stab at the field work. I plan to do a citizen satisfaction survey in Salt Lake County to see what the different groups (Draper, Salt Lake County, Salt Lake City, and the other incorporated communities) think about their local government services and the elected officials. My feeling is that since it's so hard for Salt Lake County to figure out how much money is spent where and for whom, it would be well to see where people think their money is going. After all, their perceptions of situations make those situations real.

I'll send you a copy of my research proposal before the end of this month. If you think COG would be interested in the results, I'd like to ask for enough financial support to cover postage costs. In any event, the results will be available to COG.

I selected this topic for my thesis because of all the form of government reports and the other reports put together by various groups over the last few years, no one has really gone out and asked the taxpayer what he thinks. There have been elections, of course, but I don't think those have been an adequate measure of satisfaction in the double taxation battle.

I'll look forward to talking with you soon.

Sincerely,

Lea Cottam

LC/aw